APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,583	10/29/2001	Easton F. Bell	F-352	3446

919	7590	11/02/2005		

PITNEY BOWES INC.
35 WATERVIEW DRIVE
P.O. BOX 3000
MSC 26-22
SHELTON, CT 06484-8000

EXAMINER
VIG, NARESH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3629	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/021,583	BELL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Naresh Vig	3629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>10 July 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10 and 31-37* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10 and 31-37* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This is in reference to response received on 10 July 2005 to the office action

mailed on 24 March 2005. There are 17 claims, claims 1 – 10 and 31 – 37 pending for

examination.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 – 10 and 31 – 37 are for amended

claims which have been responded to in response to amended claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention. ·

Claims 1 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has not clearly defined proxy. In the application originally filed on 29

October 29, 2001, applicant recites "If in step 66 it is determined the new device has

been identified and authenticated, then in step 68 the gateway server 12 creates and

registers a proxy for the device in a directory stored in gateway server 12. Gateway

server 12 then returns to monitoring the local network 30 in step 60" [0019], and, "In

step 88, the user can select a service from the list of available services, and in step 90

the remote device 50, via the registered proxy in gateway server 12, will invoke the

selected service of the associated device in local network 30 via network 14, gateway

server 12 and a wireless communication with the associated device of system 10"

[0020].

In an article "Proxy Server Basics", HomeNetHelp teaches that a proxy server is

a program that acts as an intermediary between computers on your LAN and computers

on the Internet. Proxy servers often have a cache built in to make web surfing faster.

Some proxy servers also allow the filtering of web content or domains. Additionally,

almost all proxy servers support logging. Just like other internet connection sharing

technologies, only one internet connection or internet IP address is needed to serve

internet data to all of the workstations on your home network.

In an article "Ask the Advisor", Advisor teaches that a proxy server is a piece of

software that acts as a middleman for network communication, filtering the data being

sent. Proxies are often used to reroute or modify network traffic. A proxy can reside on a

user's machine or on a remote server machine. In the case of AdSubtract, the proxy

resides on the user's own machine, and the user's web browser communicates with it

without the information ever leaving the user's computer.

In an article, "Setting Up A Proxy Server On Linux", Wireski teaches that many people have heard the term proxy server but don't know how it can benefit them. we all know the value of a good firewall. Some of you might even be using a firewall proxy to make life easier. A proxy server is a program that accepts requests from a client, such as a Web browser or FTP client, and forwards the request to the appropriate Internet server. It's transparent to the end user beyond the initial setup of the proxy. This method is often used when a number of computers sit physically behind another computer, which is in turn connected to the Internet. This configuration allows all of the computers simultaneous access to the Internet through one specific computer, typically the firewall or proxy server.

In a memo "SIP: Session Initiation Protocol – Locating SIP Servers", IETF teaches that an outbound proxy can be configured by any mechanism, including DHCP [3] and can be specified either as a set of parameters such as network address or host name, protocol port and transport protocol, or as a SIP URI.

Applicant has not clearly defined the capability of the Proxy Server used in the invention.

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has not disclosed status report. Is it an output on a printer, status light on a device etc.

Appropriate correction is requested. In response to this office action, applicant

should add the statement "No New Matter Has Been Added".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 10 and 31 – 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Le Carpentier US Patent 4,752,950) in view of Lee US Patent

5,657,689, and further in view of an Article "Wirelell Networking Review" by Ken Sinclair

hereinafter known as Sinclair.

Regarding claims 1, 31 and 33, LeCarpentier teaches a mailing system.

LeCarpentier teaches:

a plurality of devices associated with mail preparation, each of said plurality of

devices adapted to communicate with other of said plurality of devices via a wireless

communication [Fig. 1 and disclosure associated with Fig. 1];

a gateway server adapted to communicate with each of said plurality of devices [Fig. 1 and disclosure associated with Fig. 1].

LeCarpentier does not teach wireless communication network for LAN. However, Lee teaches one or more postal processing machine interconnected by a local area radio frequency (RF) wireless communication network.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify LeCarpentier as taught by Lee to provide mobility to users (one of the benefits of wireless is mobility).

LeCarpentier in view of Lee teaches gateway server being coupled to a communication network, gateway server and plurality of devices forming a local network [LeCarpentier, Fig. 1 and disclosure associated with Fig. 1].

LeCarpentier in view of Lee does not teach gateway server acting as a master of local network, each of said plurality of devices communicating with another of said plurality of devices via a wireless communication through said gateway server. However, Sinclair teaches gateway server acting as a master of local network, each of said plurality of devices communicating with another of said plurality of devices via a wireless communication through said gateway server.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify LeCarpentier in view of Lee as taught by Sinclair to use dynamic addressing of devices in the local area network.

LeCarpentier in view of Lee and Sinclair teaches a remote device coupled to communication network, remote device communicating with gateway server via

communication network, gateway server creating a proxy for each of said plurality of

devices (Sinclair teaches DHCP) in said local network (using only one internet

connection or internet IP address to serve internet data to all of the workstations on your

network).

wherein a service of at least one of said plurality of devices can be invoked by

said remote device utilizing said created proxy for said at least one of said plurality of

devices (using only one internet connection or internet IP address to serve internet data

to all of the workstations on your network).

LeCarpentier in view of Lee and Sinclair teaches selecting services associated

with registered mailing devices (device active on a LAN, user who wants to print will

select print job) via communication between remote device and gateway server.

LeCarpentier in view of Lee and Sinclair teaches invoking selected service via

proxy by remote device (e.g. printing on the printer wireless connected on a LAN).

Regarding claims 2 and 32, LeCarpentier in view of Lee and Sinclair teaches

wireless communications are radio frequency communications.

Regarding claim 3, LeCarpentier in view of Lee and Sinclair teaches radio

frequency communications are automatically established (Sinclair teaches DHCP).

Regarding claims 4 – 7 and 35 – 36, LeCarpentier in view of Lee and Sinclair

teaches plurality of type of devices (laptop, desktop, printer) connected wireless on a

LAN. Therefore, LeCarpentier in view of Lee and Sinclair teaches devices to include a scale, a postage meter, mail processing machine, a personal computer (design choice to decide what type of devices should to connected to a LAN to meet business requirements).

Regarding claim 8, LeCarpentier in view of Lee and Sinclair teaches a data center coupled to a said communication network, wherein gateway server communicates with data center via said communication network, said data center receiving data from and sending data to at least one of said plurality of devices via said communication network, said gateway server, and a wireless communication between said gateway server and said at least one of said plurality of devices.

Regarding claim 9, LeCarpentier in view of Lee and Sinclair teaches communication network is a public switched telephone network (Sinclair teaches modem to connect to internet via plurality of type communication connectivity like, cable, DLS)

Regarding claims 10 and 34, LeCarpentier in view of Lee and Sinclair teaches communication network is the Internet.

Regarding claim 37, LeCarpentier in view of Lee and Sinclair teaches a status report (Sinclair teaches that its gateway provided status through lights). How status is provided to a user is a design choice.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 CRF '1.111 (c) to consider the references fully when responding to this office action.

1. Ken Sinclair, Wireless Networking Review

2. SIP: Session Initiation Protocol – Locating SIP Servers

3. Dave Wireski, Setting Up A Proxy Server On Linux

4. What Is A Proxy Server

5. Karin Wikoff, Should Your Library Go Wireless

6. IBM Communication Server For Windows NT, Version 5.0

7. D-Link DI-704 User Manual

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Naresh Vig whose telephone number is (571) 272-6810.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 - 6:00 (Wednesday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

October 28, 2005   Naresh Vig
                                                             Examiner